REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 1, 2010. Claims 1-6, 8, and 10 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 3, and 5 are in independent form. Claims 1-6, 8, and 10 have been amended to define aspects of Applicant's invention more clearly. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in FIG. 1 and the description thereof in the specification.[1] Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended Claims 1, 3, and 5, as deemed necessary, to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in section 4 of the Office Action. More particularly, Claims 1, 3, and 5 have been amended to clarify that a number of the IP addresses generated by the IP address generator is equal to a number of the image processing units of the composite image processing apparatus. For example, if the composite image processing apparatus includes three image processing units, the IP address generator generates three IP addresses. It is believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal therefore is respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0142683 (*Lam et al.*), in view of a document entitled "Request for Comments No. 2462: IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration" (*Thomson et al.*), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,934,932 (*Dathathraya*); and that Claims 2, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

[1] Any examples presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

as being unpatentable over *Lam et al.*, *Thomson et al.*, and *Dathathraya*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,494 (*Ouchi*). For at least the following reasons, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 3, and 5, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a composite image processing apparatus that includes a plurality of image processing units that perform a plurality of image processing units, including a printer unit that performs a printer function and a scanner unit that performs a scanner function. Notably, the composite image processing apparatus also includes an IP address generator and a controller. The IP address generator is connected to an Internet Protocol version 6 (IPv6) router on a network and repeatedly acquires prefix information from the IPv6 router. Based on the acquired prefix information, the IP address generator generates a plurality of IP addresses. Each IP address is unique to a different one of the image processing units, and a number of the IP addresses is equal to a number of the image processing units. The controller communicates with an appliance on the network using the IP addresses generated for the image processing units. The controller also operates each of the image processing units to perform communications between each of the image processing units and the appliance, and executes a transfer task for transferring packet data. The transfer task for transferring packet data is managed by an Operating System (OS) using buffer areas allocated to the printer unit and the scanner unit, respectively.

By virtue of the operation of the IP address generator and the controller, drivers installed on a host computer that controls the image processing functions of the composite image processing apparatus can be designed independently for each of the functions, for example.

Thus, the drivers can be simplified compared to drivers for conventional, composite image processing apparatuses.

Lam et al. is understood to relate to a method for providing multi-user access to devices and the Internet (*see* paragraph 2). *Lam et al.* discusses that a peripheral access router 38 communicates with peripheral devices, such as a camera 44, a digital video disk player 46, a compact disk reader/writer 48, a storage hard drive 50, a scanner 52, a printer 54, a copier 56, and a telephone 58 (*see* paragraph 35 and FIG. 2). The peripheral access router 38 includes a memory 64 that stores a unique IP address for each of the peripheral devices 44-58 (*see* paragraph 36).

Lam et al. fails to teach or suggest that the peripheral access router 38 generates IP addresses for the peripheral devices 44-58, much less IP addresses *based on repeatedly acquiring prefix information from an IPv6 router*. *Lam et al.* also fails to teach or suggest that the peripheral access router 38 generates IP addresses that are respectively unique to a different one of a plurality of image processing units of a composite image processing apparatus. Moreover, *Lam et al.* fails to teach or suggest that a number of IP addresses provided by the peripheral access router 38 is equal to a number of image processing units of a composite image processing apparatus. For example, the copier 56 is understood to include at least two image processing units, *e.g.*, a printer and a scanner, however, the peripheral access router 38 is understood to provide only a single IP address to the copier 56.

Thomson et al. is understood to relate to autoconfiguration of IPv6 addresses (*see* Title). *Thomson et al.* discusses that a host computer can generate its own address using a combination of locally available information and information advertised by routers (*see* page 2, Introduction, paragraph 2). *Thomson et al.* fails to teach or suggest that the host computer

generates a plurality of IP addresses, much less that each of a plurality of IP addresses is unique to a different one of a plurality of units of the host computer.

Dathathraya is understood to relate to a system for managing a workflow using a plurality of different scripts (*see* col. 1, lines 8-10). *Dathathraya* discusses that a workflow system can include a computer workstation and a multifunctional peripheral (MFP) device (*see* col. 7, lines 1-2). A shell extension to the computer operating system can be installed (*see* col. 7, lines 5-6). In response to accessing the shell extension, a plurality of folders is generated (*see* col. 7, lines 7-8). A script is written for each of a plurality of folders selected from a group including: scanning, faxing, printing, and copying (*see* col. 7, lines 9-11). The folders are saved and supplied with the plurality of scripts (*see* col. 7, lines 12-14). A first number of folders is pre-selected prior to accepting a document (*see* col. 7, lines 15-16). A document capable of being processed is supplied (*see* col. 7, lines 17-18). The document is processed using a script from each selected folder (*see* col. 7, lines 19-20). A first number of scripted documents is generated and added to the selected folders (*see* col. 7, lines 21-22).

Nothing has been found in *Dathathraya* that is believed to teach or suggest that prefix information is repeatedly acquired from a IPv6 router, and that a plurality of IP addresses are generated based on the repeatedly acquired prefix information. Moreover, nothing has been found in *Dathathraya* that is believed to teach or suggest that each of a plurality of generated IP addresses is unique to a different one of a plurality of image processing units of the MFP device, where a number of the plurality of IP addresses is equal to a number of the plurality of image processing units.

In summary, Applicant submits that a combination of *Lam et al.*, *Thomson et al.*, and *Dathathraya*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or

suggest a composite image processing apparatus that includes a plurality of image processing units that perform a plurality of image processing units, including a printer unit that performs a printer function and a scanner unit that performs a scanner function, that also includes "an IP address generator connected to an IPv6 router on a network that repeatedly acquires prefix information from the IPv6 router and generates a plurality of IP addresses, based on the acquired prefix information, wherein each of the IP addresses is unique to a different one of the plurality of image processing units, and wherein a number of the IP addresses is equal to a number of the image processing units," and "a controller that communicates with at least one appliance on the network using the IP addresses generated for the image processing units and operates each of the image processing units to execute communications between each of the image processing units and the at least one appliance, and that executes a transfer task for transferring packet data," wherein "the transfer task for transferring packet data is managed by an Operating System (OS) using buffer areas allocated to the printer unit and the scanner unit, respectively," as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over *Lam et al.*, *Thomson et al.*, and *Dathathraya*, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 3 and 5 include features sufficiently similar to those of Claim 1 that these claims are believed to be patentable over *Lam et al.*, *Thomson et al.*, and *Dathathraya* for the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of independent Claims 1, 3, and 5 and are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place the present application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is believed proper and is respectfully requested, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for responding to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/
Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 5255256_1.DOC